

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

By the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 2, 6, and 7 have been amended, and claims 8 and 9 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. No new matter is believed to have been added. Thus, claims 1, 2, 6, and 7 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1 and 6 are independent.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-2 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. By the foregoing amendments, the claims have been amended to more particularly and distinctly claim the subject matter. To be more specific, "in advance" as found in the dependent claims 1 and 6 has been removed from the claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-2 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Unigraphics Solutions™ ("User's Guide Getting Started with SOLID EDGE™ Ver. 8.0").

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

Independent claim 1 has been amended so as to clarify the subject matter and clearly distinguish it over Unigraphics Solutions™.

i) Claim 1 as filed on November 24, 2008 (hereinafter, simply referred to as "claim 1 before amendment") recited "generating a two-dimensional projection by projecting an assembly model formed of a plurality of parts", which is alleged to read on the description in "Drawing Production" on page 258 of Unigraphics Solutions™ (hereinafter, simply referred to as "Unigraphics"). However, claim 1 as amended recites "generating a two-dimensional projection of a three-dimensional assembly model formed of a plurality of parts by projecting the three-dimensional assembly model formed of the plurality of parts, ***the two-dimensional projection having part information based on a coordinate system of the three-dimensional assembly model for each of the plurality of parts***" (emphasis added). "Drawing Production" in Unigraphics merely describes "The 2-D drawing can contain dimensions and other

annotations that describe the size of a part or assembly ..." (page 258). Thus, Unigraphics is silent about "two-dimensional projection having part information based on a coordinate system of the three-dimensional assembly model for each of the plurality of parts".

ii) Claim 1 before amendment recited "grouping two-dimensional elements in the two-dimensional projection for each part of the assembly model", which is alleged to read on the descriptions in "Documenting Multiple Parts in One Draft Document" on page 274 and "Maintaining Relationships" and "How Relationships Work" on page 150 of Unigraphics. However, claim 1 as amended recites "grouping two-dimensional elements together in the two-dimensional projection for each of the plurality of parts to form a part group for each of the plurality of parts". "Documenting Multiple Parts in One Draft Document" in Unigraphics describes "Solid Edge allows you to document multiple parts or assemblies in a single draft document". "Maintaining Relationships" in Unigraphics describes "Maintaining relationships between 2-D elements makes the elements associative to each other. When you modify an element that is related to another element, the other element updates automatically". "How Relationships Work" in Unigraphics describes "If you apply a perpendicular relationship between the two lines, and move one line, the other line moves with it." All of these descriptions in Unigraphics are irrelevant to the recitation in claim 1 as amended, particularly to the expression **"grouping two-dimensional elements together ... for each of the plurality of parts"** (emphasis added).

iii) Claim 1 before amendment recited "adding in advance attributes of each part of the assembly model to the two-dimensional projection as part information required for a reprojection, the part information including a part name, a line of sight, and a position of each part of the assembly model, the part information being obtained when the assembly model is projected", which is alleged to read on the descriptions in "Annotations and Associativity" on page 296, "Setting Projection Angle" (for line of sight) on page 269, "When you change parts and assemblies in part views, you can easily update the views so they match the new model geometry" on page 280, and "Drawing views for Parts in Assemblies on pages 231 and 258" on pages 278-279 of Unigraphics. However, claim 1 as amended recites "adding the part information to the part group when said grouping is performed, the part information including a part name, a line of sight, and a part position for each of the plurality of parts". Here, the part information, as defined in i) above, is based on a coordinate system of the three-dimensional assembly model. "Annotations and Associativity" in Unigraphics describes "An associative annotation moves when the element it is connected to moves." "Setting Projection Angle for line

of sight" in Unigraphics describes "The projection angle is dependent on the Mechanical drafting standard you use and, typically, once you set the projection angle you will rarely, if ever, need to re-set it. Mechanical drafting standards use either a first angle projection or a third angle projection for creating multi-view projections of a part on a drawing sheet. You can set the projection angle with the Options command ..." "When you change parts and assemblies in part views, you can easily update the views so they match the new model geometry" on page 280 of Unigraphics refers to part-to-part or assembly-to-assembly update. For example, while Unigraphics describes "This works because part views are associative to the 3-D part or assembly they were created from" on page 280, the same page shows, as an example, a 3-D part view having a newly made hole and a 2-D part view in which the hole is shown. "Drawing views for Parts in Assemblies on pages 231 and 258" on pages 278-279 in Unigraphics merely describes the view manipulation and illustrated examples of views such as part view alignment, scaling drawing views, cropping drawing views, and rotating drawing views. Therefore, the sections of Unigraphics cited by the Examiner are silent about "adding the part information (based on a coordinate system of the three-dimensional assembly model) to the part group when said grouping is performed, the part information including a part name, a line of sight, and a part position for each of the plurality of parts" as recited in amended claim 1.

iv) Claim 1 before amendment recited "loading a modified three-dimensional part model generated by modifying a shape of a three-dimensional part model that is a part of the assembly model", which is alleged to read on the descriptions in "Part View Updates" on page 280 of Unigraphics. However, claim 1 as amended recites "**leaving three-dimensional the assembly model unloaded** and loading, as a target for a partial reprojection, a modified three-dimensional part model of a part of which a shape has been modified among the plurality of parts" (emphasis added). "Part View Updates" in Unigraphics describes "When you change parts and assemblies depicted in part views, you can easily update the views so they match the new model geometry." While it is described that "This works because part views are associative to the 3-D part or assembly they were created from" on page 280, the same page shows, as an example, a 3-D part view having a newly made hole and a 2-D part view in which the hole is shown. Therefore, Unigraphics does not show or depict how the change in part views is reflected in the original three-dimensional assembly model.

v) Claim 1 before amendment recited "deciding a projecting direction of the modified three-dimensional part model based on a line of sight of a part to be reprojected included in the part information", which is alleged to read on the descriptions in "Part View Updates" and 2-

D diagram drawing on page 280 of Unigraphics. However, claim 1 as amended recites **"deciding a projecting direction applicable to the modified three-dimensional part model based on the line of sight included in the part information"** of the part whose modified three-dimensional part model is to be subjected to the partial reprojection" (emphasis added). "Part View Updates" in Unigraphics describes "When you change parts and assemblies depicted in part views, you can easily update the views so they match the new model geometry," and it refers to part-to-part or assembly-to-assembly update. For example, while it is described "This works because part views are associative to the 3-D part or assembly they were created from" on page 280, the same page shows, as an example, a 3-D part view having a newly made hole and a 2-D part view in which the hole is shown. Therefore, Unigraphics fails to teach the recitation in claim 1 discussed above.

vi) Claim 1 before amendment recited "deciding a generating position of two-dimensional elements of the modified three-dimensional part model based on a position of the part to be reprojected included in the part information", which is alleged to read on the descriptions in "Part View Updates" and 2-D diagram drawing on page 280 of Unigraphics. However, claim 1 as amended recites "deciding, in the two-dimensional projection of the assembly model, a generating position in which two-dimensional elements of the modified three-dimensional part model are to be generated **based on the part position included in the part information** of the part whose modified three-dimensional part model is to be subjected to the partial reprojection" (emphasis added). Further, the part information is based on a coordinate system of the three-dimensional assembly model. In contrast, "Part View Updates" in Unigraphics describes "When you change parts and assemblies depicted in part views, you can easily update the views so they match the new model geometry", and it refers to part-to-part or assembly-to-assembly update. For example, while it is described "This works because part views are associative to the 3-D part or assembly they were created from" on page 280 of Unigraphics, the same page shows, as an example, a 3-D part view having a newly made hole and a 2-D part view in which the hole is shown. Therefore, Unigraphics fails to teach the recitation in claim 1 discussed above.

vii) Claim 1 before amendment recited "performing, based on the decided projecting direction and the decided generating position, the reprojection of the modified three-dimensional part model to generate a modified two-dimensional projection," which is alleged to read also on the descriptions in "Part View Updates" and 2-D diagram drawing on page 280 of Unigraphics. However, claim 1 as amended recites "performing, based on the projecting

direction and the generating position thus decided, the partial reprojection of the modified three-dimensional part model, and generating a modified version of the two-dimensional projection of the assembly model by reflecting the shape that has been changed". As can be seen in this recitation, the partial reprojection of the modified three-dimensional part model is performed in accordance with the decided projecting direction and generating position which are based on a coordinate system of the three-dimensional assembly model. In contrast, "Part View Updates" in Unigraphics describes "When you change parts and assemblies depicted in part views, you can easily update the views so they match the new model geometry", and it refers to part-to-part or assembly-to-assembly update. For example, while it is described "This works because part views are associative to the 3-D part or assembly they were created from" on page 280 of Unigraphics, the same page shows, as an example, a 3-D part view having a newly made hole and a 2-D part view in which the hole is shown. Therefore, Unigraphics fails to teach the recitation in claim 1 discussed above.

Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. In view of the distinction of claim 1 noted above, at least the elements described above are not present in Unigraphics. Hence, Unigraphics does not anticipate claim 1.

In view of the foregoing discussion, the rejection of claim 1 is improper. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 6

Independent claim 6 has been amended so as to clarify the subject matter and clearly distinguish it over Unigraphics Solutions™.

It is alleged that claim 6 is rejected since Unigraphics is directed to a computer-readable medium storing a program for a three-dimensional CAD system that enables reflection of a shape modified in a part model on a two-dimensional projection generated from an assembly model, the program causing a computer perform the method steps of claims 1-2 and are therefore rejected under the same prior art.

For this reason of rejection, it is assumed that each and every feature of independent claim 6 is read on the same section in Unigraphics as applied in the rejection of claim 1. Accordingly, the same argument as applied to the rejection of independent claim 1 is also applied to the rejection of independent claim 6.

Anticipation requires the presence in a prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. In view of the distinction of claim 6 noted above, at least the elements described above are not present in Unigraphics. Hence, Unigraphics does not anticipate claim 6.

In view of the foregoing discussion, the rejection of claim 6 is improper. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

DEPENDENT CLAIM 2

Claim 2 depends from independent claim 1. A basis for how Unigraphics is deficient vis-à-vis claim 1 has been discussed above. Hence, dependent claim 2 is patentable at least for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

In view of the foregoing discussion, the rejection of claim 2 is improper. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

DEPENDENT CLAIM 7

Claim 7 depends from independent claim 6. A basis for how Unigraphics is deficient vis-à-vis claim 6 has been discussed above. Hence, dependent claim 7 is patentable at least for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 6.

In view of the foregoing discussion, the rejection of claim 7 is improper. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CLAIMS 8, 9

Claims 8 and 9 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Accordingly, the rejections of claims 8 and 9 have become moot.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in immediate condition for allowance, and thus, reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephonically contact the undersigned to attend to such matters. If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: _____ July 2, 2009 _____

By: _____
Mehdi D. Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501